IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1247 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE H.K.RATHOD

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

YOGESH KANTIBHAI RAVANI

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

M/S THAKKAR ASSOC. for Petitioner

Mr. HL Jani, AGP for Respondent No. 1to3

Ms. PJ Davawala, Addl. Standing Counsel for Respondent No. 4

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE H.K.RATHOD

Date of decision: 15/06/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Heard Mr. D.M. Thakkar, learned advocate for the petitioner and Mr. H.L. Jani, learned AGP for respondents nos. 1 to 3 and Ms. P.J.Davawala, learned Addl. Standing

Counsel for respondent No.4. In this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the impugned order of detention dated 10th January, 2001 has been challenged by the petitioner.

Today, when the matter was taken up for hearing, learned AGP Mr. Jani has made a statement before this Court that the impugned order of detention which has been passed against the petitioner has been revoked on 26th February, 2001 by the Advisory Board and, therefore, the present petition has become infructuous. Mr. Jani has also made a clear statement that the detenu has been released by the concerned authority. The statement made by Mr. Jani, learned AGP has not been disputed by the learned advocate Mr. D.M. Thakkar appearing for the petitioner. Therefore, in view of the statement made by Mr. Jani, learned AGP which has not been disputed by Mr. D.M. Thakkar, learned advocate for the petitioner, according to my opinion, this petition has become infructuous. Same is, therefore, disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule is discharged. There shall be no order as to costs.

15.6.2001. (H.K. Rathod,J.)

Vyas